UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/747,691	12/30/2003	Mitchell S. Steiner	P-4595-US2	2853

49443 7590 04/10/2007

PEARL COHEN ZEDEK LATZER, LLP
1500 BROADWAY 12TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10036

EXAMINER	
WEDDINGTON, KEVIN E	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1614	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/747,691	STEINER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kevin E. Weddington	1614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 March 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-40* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *11-40* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 December 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *11-15-04; 3-1-06*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claims 1-40 are presented for examination.

Applicants' drawings filed December 30, 2005 and the information disclosure statements filed November 15, 2004 and March 1, 2006 have been received and entered.

Applicants' election filed March 8, 2007 in response to the restriction requirement of February 9, 2007 has been received and entered. The applicants elected the invention described in claims 1-10 (Group I) with traverse.

Applicants' traverse is not deemed persuasive for reasons set forth in the previous Office action dated February 9, 2007; therefore, the restriction requirement is hereby made Final.

Claims 11-40 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to the non-elected invention (37 CFR 1.142(b)).

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention

made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-10 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of copending Application No. 10/778,333. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the present application teaches a method of treating a subject with hot flashes with an anti-estrogen agent; and the copending application teaches a method of treating a subject with hot flashes with a selective estrogen receptor modulator (SERM). However, to one skilled the art, SERM is one type of an anti-estrogen agent; therefore, the present application encompasses the copending application.

Claims 1-10 are not allowed.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably

convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

This is a written description rejection.

Claims 1-4 described an anti-estrogen agent is a selective estrogen receptor modulator (SERM). The instant claims cover all compounds having the pharmaceutical property of being a SERM to treat hot flashes. Describing a compound by its functions will not substitute for written description of the structure of the compound. The invention should be described in such a way as to described what the invention is, not what the invention does. Describing the function of a compound fails to distinguish the compound from other molecules or agents that can perform the same functions.

Undue experimentation is a conclusion reaches by weighing the noted factual considerations set forth below as seen in In re Wands, 858 F. 2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1401 (Fed. Cir. 1988). A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding a fair evaluation of an appropriate combination of the factors below, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation.

The factors include:

1) the quantity of experimentation necessary

2) the amount of direction or guidance provided

3) the presence or absence of working examples

4) the nature of the invention

5) the state of the art

6) the relative skill of those in the art

7) the predictability of the art and

8) the breadth of the claims

The instant specification fails to provide guidance that would allow the skilled artisan background sufficient to practice that instant invention without resorting to undue experimentation in view of further discussion below.

The nature of the invention, state of the prior art, relative skill of those in the art and the predictability of the art

Claims 1-4 are directed to an anti-estrogen agent that is a selective estrogen receptor modulator (SERM) that is used to treat hot flashes. The instant claims cover all compounds having pharmaceutical property of being known as a (SERM) to treat hot flashes. Although claims 3 an 4 lists specific examples of agents which are (SERM) to treat hot flashes, and claims 1 and 2 are directed to a variety of agents with the functional description of being known as a compound which is alleged to have the property to treat hot flashes.

The prior art, Khovidhunkit et al., "Clinical Effects of Raloxifene Hydrochloride in Women", Annals of Internal Medicine, Vol. 130, No. 5, pp. 431-439 (1999), teaches raloxifene hydrochloride, a SERM, caused hot flashes (an adverse effect) and not treating hot flashes in women (see page 437 under **Adverse Effects**).

The instant claims are very broad. For instance, claims 1 and 2 are to a plethora of compounds of as described by the functional properties as being known to treat hot flashes.

The relative skill of those in the art is generally that of a Ph.D. or M.D.

One skilled in the art would not predict from the instant disclosure which compounds would fall under the umbrella of functional description of being known as broadly as a SERM. In fact, the courts have made a distinction between mechanical elements function the same in different circumstances, yielding predictable results, chemical and biological compounds often react unpredictably under different circumstances.

The breadth of the claims

The claims are very broad and inclusive to all SERM to treat hot flashes.

The amount of direction or guidance provided and the presence or absence of working examples

No examples showing the SERM such as clomifene, raloxifene, tamoxifen, bazedoxifene, lasofoxifene, and ormeloxifene are effective in treating hot flashes.

The working example only shows toremifene to be effective to treat hot flashes.

The quantity of experimentation necessary

Applicants have failed to provide guidance as to how the skilled artisan would be able to extrapolate from the disclosure and examples provided to make and possibly use the claimed invention. The amount of guidance or direction needed to

enable the invention is inversely related to the degree of predictability in the art. Thus, although a single embodiment may provide broad enablement in cases involving predictable factors, such as mechanical or electrical elements, in cases involving unpredictable factors, such as most chemical reactions and physiological activity, more teaching or guidance is required. (In re Fischer, 427 F. 2d 839, 166 USPQ 24; Ex Parte Hitzeman, 9 USPQ 2d 1823).

The quantity of experimentation needed to be performed by one skilled in the art is yet another factor involved in the determining whether "undue experimentation" is required to make and use the instant invention. The test is not merely quantitative, since a considerable amount of experimentation is permissible, if its is merely routine, or of the specification in question provides a reasonable amount of guidance with respect to the direction in which the experimentation should proceed. For these reasons, one of ordinary skill in the art would be burdened with undue "painstaking experimentation study" to determine all the compounds or agents that are broadly known to possess the property of treating hot flashes as described in this specification. In view of the information set forth supra, the instant disclosure is not seen to be sufficient to describe the use of any compound, which is regarded as the functional description of an anti-estrogen (SERM) for treating hot flashes.

Therefore, undue experimentation would be required to practice the invention as it is claimed in its current scope.

Claims 1-4 are not allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1 and 5-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by WO 01/49673 A2, hereby known as Bhagwat et al.

Bhagwat et al. teach compounds whose mechanisms are to modulate estrogen receptors (same an anti-estrogens) and used to treat hot flashes (see the abstract). Note particular to page 30, lines 15-29 and page 31, lines 1-6 shows the compounds can be formulated into capsules, tablets, solutions, suspensions, and etc. Page 31, lines 7-11 shows the dosage ranges of compounds from 0.1 mg to 100 mg in a human. Note applicants' preferred dosages of claims 7-10 falls within the cited reference range.

Clearly, the cited reference teaches every limitation of the applicants' instant invention; therefore, the instant invention is unpatentable.

Claims 1 and 5-10 are not allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Merchenthaler et al., "The effect of estrogens and antiestrogen in a rat model for hot flush", Maturitas, Vol 30, No. 3, pp. 307-316 (1998).

Merchenthaler et al. teach the administration of two selective estrogen receptor modulators (SERM), raloxifene and tamoxifen to treat hot flashes (see the abstract). Note on page 314, first column, second paragraph shows raloxifene is inconsistent to treat hot flush (flashes in rats). However, one page 314, second column, lines 7-9 shows tamoxifen produced results to treat hot flushes.

Clearly, the cited reference anticipates the applicants' instant invention by showing an anti-estrogen agent such as a SERM can treat hot flushes (hot flashes).

Claims 1 and 2 are not allowed.

The remaining references listed on the enclosed PTO-892 are cited to show the state of the art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin E. Weddington whose telephone number is (571)272-0587. The examiner can normally be reached on 12:30 pm-9:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel can be reached on (571)272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kevin E. Weddington
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1614

K. Weddington
April 1, 2007